

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1-21 are presented for examination. Applicants have amended various claims to cure typographical errors and section 112 concerns in an effort to place this application in condition for allowance.

I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 11 is amended to cure this rejection.

II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-10, 12-14, 17-21 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 4,914,571 (Baratz). These rejections are traversed.

The independent claims recite numerous recitations that are not taught or even suggested in Baratz. By way of example, independent claim 1 recites generating a request for a component having at least one specified attribute that “describes a service performed by the component.”

In Baratz, each network node maintains a directory about resources that reside at the end nodes. This directory includes a list of “resource names” at the node (see 4: 1-7). In order to locate a resource, a broadcast search is performed. The broadcast includes a GDS variable and search argument (see 12: 16-24). The GDS variable “provides the destination node and origin NN series ...” (see 14: 30-35). The search argument contains several bits that specify length, key, resource type, and resource name (see Figs. 7A-7D: 15: 19-23 and 16: 43-49). Nowhere does Baratz teach that the broadcast includes an attribute that “describes a service performed by the component.” Instead, the broadcast in Baratz includes bits that identify a resource type and resource name. A service performed by the resource is not identified in the broadcast.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Baratz.

III. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Baratz in view of USPN 6,889,254 (Chandra). This rejection is traversed.

As noted in section II, Baratz does not teach or suggest all the elements of the independent claims. Chandra fails to cure these deficiencies. Dependent claims 11 and 16 depend from independent claims 1 and 12, respectively. Thus, for at least the reasons provided in connection with independent claims 1 and 12, respective dependent claims 11 and 16 are allowable over Baratz in view of Chandra.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529